



MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE & PARKS

PO Box 200701 Helena, MT 59620-0701
(406) 444-9947

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

PART I. PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

1. Project Title: Bigfork Gun Club Proposed Improvement Project

2. Type of Proposed Action:

Members of the Bigfork Gun Club (BFGC) propose to construct a 200- and 300-yard rifle range with 20 shooting positions on 6.5 acres recently purchased adjacent to the existing facilities.

3. Location Affected by Proposed Action:

The Bigfork Gun Club is located on Highway 83 approximately 9 miles southeast of Bigfork, Montana at 14210 Hwy 83, Bigfork, MT, 59911; Lat. 48.01043, Long. -113.95073; Section 13, Township 26 North, Range 19 West (Figure 1 and 2).




Figure 1. General Location of Bigfork Gun Club, Bigfork, MT.




Figure 2 – Bigfork Gun Club Parcel Map, Bigfork, Montana.

4. Agency Authority for the Proposed Action: MCA 87-1-276 through 87-1-279 (Legislative established policies and procedures for the establishment and improvement of shooting ranges) and MCA 87-2-105 (Departmental authority to expend funds to provide training in the safe handling and use of firearms and safe hunting practices). The Montana Legislature has authorized funding for the establishment of a Shooting Range Development Program providing financial assistance for the development of shooting ranges. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP) has responsibility for the administration of the program, including the necessary guidelines and procedures governing applications for funding assistance under the program.

To be eligible for grant assistance, a private shooting club or a private organization:

(a)(i) Shall accept in its membership any person who holds or is eligible to hold a Montana hunting license and who pays club or organization membership fees;

(ii) May not limit the number of members;

(iii) May charge a membership fee not greater than the per-member share of the club's or organization's reasonable cost of provision of services, including establishment, improvement, and maintenance of shooting facilities and other membership services; and

(iv) Shall offer members occasional guest privileges at no cost to the member or invited guest and shall make a reasonable effort to hold a public sight-in day each September, when the general public may use the shooting range for a day-use fee or at no cost; or

(b) Shall admit the general public for a reasonable day-use fee.




Figure 3 Concept Plan for the Proposed Rifle Ranges.

5. Need for the Action(s):

The Bigfork Gun Club currently has a centerfire rifle range with 25-, 50- and 100-meter lanes and berms. A single station 200-yd range is the longest range currently available at the BFGC. The proposed 200- and 300-yard rifle range will significantly increase safety, shooting opportunities, quality for practice, instruction, and competition for all users. Members and guests will be able to use the proposed 200- and 300-yard rifle range to instruct, practice, and compete in rifle marksmanship. Both informal practice and scheduled competitions will be available to members and the public. The range will also be available to agencies and groups for instruction.

6. Objectives for the Action(s):

The 2019 goal for the Bigfork Gun Club is construction of a 200- and 300-yard rifle range with 20 shooting positions in order to improve shooting opportunities and the long-term usefulness and convenience of the facility the club members, local community, and general public.

7. Project Size: estimate the number of acres that would be directly affected:

The proposed project would involve approximately 7 acres of the 28-acre Bigfork Gun Club.

8. Affected Environment (A brief description of the affected area of the proposed project):

The BFGC is located on 28 acres of privately owned land deeded to the Bigfork Gun Club. The property is not located within a floodplain and there are no permanent surface waters or wetlands on the property. The range offers shooting opportunities for rifle, pistol, shotgun, and cowboy action shooting.

9. Description of Project:

The proposed project involves construction of a 200- and 300-yard long-range rifle range with 20 shooting stands on a newly acquired 6.5-acre parcel of land. The 6.5-acre tract will be cleared and landscaped to accommodate the new range. Earthworks will be required to grade the shooting range and parking area, fill depressions, construct berms and target pits. Concrete shooting pads, cover and benches will be constructed at shooting stations.

▪ Design/Engineering/Architect	\$ 1,500
▪ Labor and Contracted Services	\$ 17,860
▪ Construction/Materials	\$ 42,933
▪ Targets and Misc. Expenses	\$ 3,750
▪ Total Project Budget	\$ 66,043
▪ Total Funding Requested from FWP	\$ 33,022

10. List any Other Local, State, or Federal Agency that has Overlapping or Additional Jurisdiction:

None

Permits, Licenses and/or Authorizations:

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Permit</u>	<u>Date Filed/#</u>
N/A		

Funding:

<u>Agency Name</u>	<u>Funding Amount</u>
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks	\$33,022

11. Affiliations, Cooperating Agencies, User Groups and/or Supporting Groups:

The Bigfork Gun Club is located on 28 acres of private land deeded to the BFGC. This is a private range with a membership fee of \$90 for individuals and \$140 for families, though the range is open to visitors and guests of members for free or a small fee. The BFGC hosts approximately 50 events each year and approximately 11 organizations use the range each year, including: 4-H, FWP Hunters Education, Hunter Sight-In, Youth Shotgun SCTP, NRA classes in all disciplines, FWP Bow Hunter Certification, Becoming an Outdoor Woman, and Boy Scouts. In addition, numerous activities sponsored by the BFGC are held at the range, including defensive pistol, small bore, archery, cowboy action shooting, private shooting classes, and conceal weapon permit training.

12. History of the Planning and Scoping Process, and Any Public Involvement:

Because the Bigfork Gun Club is a nonprofit private shooting club for members, there has been no public involvement in the planning process. Proposed range development proposals have been discussed with the club members and the associated project vendors and contractors.

13. List of Agencies Consulted/Contacted During Preparation of the EA:

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

14. Names, Address, and Phone Number of Project Sponsor:

Jeffrey Foley, 328 South Many Lakes Drive, Kalispell, MT 59901. (907) 317-1469.

15. Other Pertinent Information:

The Bigfork Gun Club is a private nonprofit shooting club. The closest shooting range providing similar shooting opportunities is in Kalispell, Montana, 20 miles from the BFGC.

Shooting range applications require the participating governing body to approve by resolution its submission of applications for shooting range-funding assistance. Resolution Date: January 16, 2019.

PART II. IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES

Alternative A, the Proposed Alternative, and Alternative B, the No Action Alternative, were considered.

Alternative A (Proposed Alternative) is as described in Part I, paragraph 9 (Description of Project): to construct a 200- and 300-yard rifle range with 20 shooting positions at the Bigfork Gun Club Range. There are beneficial consequences to acceptance of the **Proposed Alternative**.

Alternative B (No Action Alternative) Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks Shooting Range Development Grant money would be denied and the area will remain as an active shooting range without the proposed improvements. The No Action alternative would have no significant negative environmental or potentially negative consequences. The range will continue on with present conditions. Land use would remain the same.

Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives (including the No Action alternative) to the proposed action whenever alternatives are reasonably available and prudent to consider and a discussion of how the alternatives would be implemented: Only the proposed alternative and the No Action alternative were considered. There were no other alternatives that were deemed reasonably available, nor prudent. Neither the proposed alternative nor the No Action alternative would have significant negative environmental or potentially negative consequences.

Describe any Alternatives considered and eliminated from Detailed Study:

None. Only the proposed alternative and the No Action alternative were considered. There was no other alternative that were deemed reasonably available, or prudent. Neither the **Proposed Alternative** nor the **No Action Alternative** would have significant negative environmental or potentially negative consequences.

List and explain proposed mitigating measures (stipulations):

None

PART III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Abbreviated Checklist – The degree and intensity determines extent of Environmental Review. An abbreviated checklist may be used for those projects that are not complex, controversial, or are not in environmentally sensitive areas.

Table 1. Potential impact on physical environment.

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below
1. Unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources				X		
2. Terrestrial or aquatic life and/or habitats				X		2
3. Introduction of new species into an area				X		
4. Vegetation cover, quantity & quality			X			4
5. Water quality, quantity & distribution (surface or groundwater)				X		5
6. Existing water right or reservation				X		
7. Geology & soil quality, stability & moisture				X		7
8. Air quality or objectionable odors				X		8
9. Historical & archaeological sites				X		9
10. Demands on environmental resources of land, water, air & energy				X		
11. Aesthetics				X		

2. & 5. There are no delineated wetlands or natural water sources within the area proposed for development. No critical wildlife habitat is located on the site and, therefore, would not be affected by the proposed project. The proposed project would have only minor and short-term impacts on wildlife and native plant species. Resident or transient wildlife may temporarily leave the area during construction but would return upon project completion.

4. The elimination of vegetation for clearing the 6.5 acres and the construction of the long-range rifle range will have a minor impact on the overall abundance and diversity of plant species within the area. The proposed project occupies a small portion of the property. Due to prior land use, native vegetation has been disturbed in the area of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have a minor impact on native vegetation in the area.

7. The proposed project will cause limited displacement of soils but the developments will not substantially effect geological features or establish new erosion patterns. Soil disruption for this site

is localized. Erosion control measures will be in effect and disturbed area will be reseeded.

8. Minor and temporary dust and vehicle emissions would be created by construction equipment during construction. However, the construction time is short and human effects will be limited due to the sparse population near the property.

9. This project uses no federal funds nor does it take place on state owned or controlled property; therefore, the Federal 106 Regulations and the State Antiques Act do not apply.

Table 2. Potential impacts on human environment.

Will the proposed action result in potential impacts to:	Unknown	Potentially Significant	Minor	None	Can Be Mitigated	Comments Below
1. Social structures and cultural diversity				X		
2. Changes in existing public benefits provided by wildlife populations and/or habitat				X		
3. Local and state tax base and tax revenue				X		
4. Agricultural production				X		4
5. Human health				X		
6. Quantity & distribution of community & personal income				X		
7. Access to & quality of recreational activities				X		7
8. Locally adopted environmental plans & goals (ordinances)				X		
9. Distribution & density of population and housing				X		
10. Demands for government services				X		
11. Industrial and/or commercial activity				X		

4. The site is surrounded by forested land owned by Stoltz Lumber Company and is not under agricultural production.

7. The proposed developments will increase shooting opportunities within the community.

PART IV. NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND COMMENT

All of the pertinent or potential impacts of the project have been reviewed, discussed, and analyzed. None of the project actions reviewed were complex, controversial, or located in an environmentally sensitive area. The project being implemented is already on an existing range or altered areas that together with the insignificant environmental effects of the proposed action, indicates that this should be considered the final version of the environmental assessment. There are no significant environmental or economic impacts associated with the proposed alternative.

The Bigfork Gun Club's Proposed Alternative, to construct a 200- and 300-yard long-range rifle range, is supported by its members and the public. Therefore, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks should approve the Proposed Alternative (A) for the improvements as outlined in Part I, Paragraph 9.

PART V. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Does the proposed action involve potential risks or adverse effects, which are uncertain but extremely harmful if they were to occur? No

Does the proposed action have impacts that are individually minor, but cumulatively significant or potentially significant? Individually, the proposed actions have minor impacts. However, it was determined that there are no significant or potentially significant cumulatively impacts. Cumulative impacts have been assessed considering any incremental impact of the proposed action when they are combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, and no significant impacts or substantially controversial issues were found. There are no extreme hazards created with this project and there are no conflicts with the substantive requirements of any local, state, or federal law, regulation, standard or formal plan.

Recommendation and justification concerning preparation of EIS:

There are no significant environmental or economic impacts associated with the proposed alternative; therefore, an EIS is not required.

PART VI. EA CONCLUSION SECTION

Individuals or groups contributing to, or commenting on, this EA:

- Jeffrey Foley, 328 South Many Lakes Drive, Kalispell, MT 59901. (907) 317-1469.
- MT Fish Wildlife and Parks

EA prepared by:

Andrea Darling, Darling Natural Resource Consulting, Montana City, MT 59634

Date Completed:

April 3, 2019

Describe public involvement, if any:

This draft EA will be advertised on FWP's web site and through a legal ad in the *Daily Inter Lake, Kalispell, MT* announcing a public comment period. A press release will also announce the project and comment period.